

FROM Robert Samuel White
TO [Program Manager]
DATE May 9, 2025, 9:00 PM PT
SUBJECT **Re: Follow-Up on Our March 25 Call**
DOCUMENT 01JTW5KP2G3YRHJCP9QCFDX1T4

Hi [Program Manager],

Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me. I've reflected on our conversation and want to offer some additional context for the record—both to clarify key points and to express concern about how some of what I shared may be interpreted.

Throughout our conversation, I sensed a familiar pattern—where thoughtful, human interactions were being reframed post hoc as “inappropriate” or “concerning.” That reframing is not new to me. I experienced it often during my time at Honeyman, and it appeared again during our call. I want to be transparent about what I witnessed, and how it continues to shape my understanding of the institutional dynamics at play.

Some moments I feel are important to emphasize:

[Park Manager] telling me to “eat glass” during our March 5 meeting was not a miscommunication—it was inappropriate and aggressive. What I did not mention in the call, but now want to add, is that he used this same phrase in the Welcome Center the very first time he confronted me. That makes it a pattern. I have reason to believe this is not an isolated incident.

At the end of that March 5 meeting, [Park Manager] spent five minutes repeating that “I could just leave” if I felt uncomfortable. That wasn't support—it was pressure. The interaction felt coercive and deeply unprofessional. And you can hear it clearly in his tone.

[Volunteer Services Lead]'s behavior, including doing stretches in front of me during a long shift at the Welcome Center, created discomfort and blurred boundaries. As a new volunteer, I didn't know how to respond appropriately to a situation where I felt my professionalism was being tested by someone in a position of authority.

[Volunteer Services Lead] also told me that Ranger [Park staff] would train me, a commitment he never followed through on—[Park staff] had no knowledge of it. That breach was the final breakdown of

trust in what was already a fragile dynamic.

[Park Manager] admitted in our meeting that he never gave me the benefit of the doubt, beginning with my initial interaction with [Park Supervisor]. That admission confirms the feeling I carried throughout my time at Honeyman: that I was being judged through a fixed lens, regardless of my conduct.

The journal incident was misrepresented. My comment to the ranger assistant—"not all rangers are helpful"—was not a criticism of staff. It was an appeal to ensure the journal was not ignored in the lost and found. As someone who has been homeless, I know the emotional significance of a journal, and I was simply asking that extra care be taken.

The issue of guest perception was related to my early text message to [Park Supervisor] when the power went out. My statement that "I own this problem in the eyes of guests" was not a misunderstanding of my role. It was an accurate reflection of how guests see park hosts—as the first point of contact. My message was about optics, not blame or misalignment.

The common thread in all of this, and what I believe is the real issue, is how I've held leadership accountable in writing. The primary concern [Park Manager] raised in that March 5 meeting was not my behavior—it was my emails. The vast majority of that meeting centered on my written communication, which I've always approached with clarity and intent. The discomfort, in my view, stemmed not from what I said—but from the fact that I said it in a format that created a record. This is an undeniable pattern that strikes at the heart of accountability and transparency.

Additionally, I want to acknowledge something I did not bring up on the call: I am aware of at least three other volunteers who have had similar challenges with [Park Manager]. His behavior is not isolated. His approach to volunteers appears to follow a consistent pattern. I raise this not to accuse, but to suggest that what I experienced fits into a broader pattern that may be worth further attention.

I'm not sharing this to escalate or attack, but to ensure that the story doesn't get flattened into something it never was. I've remained calm, communicative, and reflective throughout my time in this program. I've adapted, learned, and tried to contribute with sincerity and care. If there are aspects of my communication style that feel different, that is not a threat—it's a strength. And it should not be weaponized to create distance or distrust.

All I ask is that this be viewed with honesty and fairness. I am not asking for special treatment—just integrity in how this is held and assessed.

The integrity of any volunteer program depends not only on the contributions of its volunteers—but on the willingness of leadership to be accountable when trust is compromised.

Please include this message in my file as part of the ongoing review.

Warm Regards,

Sam White

I will call you tomorrow at 9:00 am. Thank you.

[Program Manager]
| Engagement Programs Manager